

Please note my views while reviewing media ownership rules:

I strongly feel that our country only benefits from keeping its' citizens well informed. To be well informed requires excellent news sources. It has been shown through a five year study by "The Project for Excellence in Journalism" that news stations owned by small media stations provide superior news (based on content, depth, dependability and validity) compared to news stations belonging to large conglomerates. Because of this, I am opposed to changes in the ownership rules that allow for expansion of conglomerations (cross ownership of different media, etc..). More importantly, though, I believe freedom of speech/freedom of press and right to information will be hindered by single company control over several media sources. Already, we have seen the negative effect of cooperate control on hundreds of radio stations across America; under strong recommendation of ownership radio stations changed their line up to play patriot music as America went to war with Iraq. The American radio was flooded with "support the war" themes in music, even when a handful of DJs openly admitted disapproval between songs. The overall effect on the public after exposure to this controlled/biased radio broadcasting was a skewed sense of how supported the war was. It seemed that many people/stations supported war. In truth, though, it was only one owner of a company that owns many stations that expressed an opinion through many sources. It is obvious that one opinion should not be able to permeate multiple news/media sources and it is obvious that one company cannot be trusted to own multiple media and not use them to express an opinion. I am scared of the power one company could have over the perceptions of a nation. I hope that my concerns will be eased in the hands of those reviewing these rules.

I appreciate your time, Michelle Ellis